

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 7 and 8 have been amended. Claim 2 has been cancelled. New claim 9 has been added. Claims 1 and 3-9 are pending and under consideration.

No new matter is being presented, and approval of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

In the Office Action, at page 3, claims 1 – 3, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Brown et al. (U.S. Patent 6,073,137) (hereinafter "Brown") in view of Yeung et al. (U.S. 2003/0093556) (hereinafter "Yeung"). Claim 2 is cancelled herein; however, the features thereof are substantially incorporated into independent claims 1, 7 and 8. The rejections of claims 1, 3, 7 and 8 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

On page 3 of the Action, the Examiner notes that Brown does not disclose a file system that reads documents by use of a scanner and files the documents on the basis of the obtained information, as recited in independent claim 1, for example. Thus, Yeung is cited as disclosing this feature. Further, on the continuation sheet of the Advisory Action, the Examiner merely states that Brown does not teach using a scanner and filing documents on the basis of the obtained information, and Yeung is cited as disclosing these features.

Thus, it appears that the Examiner misunderstood our arguments presented in the Response After Final Rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that it is not only the file system that reads documents by use of a scanner and files the documents on the basis of the obtained information that Brown fails to disclose, but Brown also fails to teach or suggest creating the *same folder configuration* in a file system, as recited in independent claim 1, for example (emphasis added).

Instead, Brown discloses a method for updating and displaying that is carried out between an e-mail client 37 and a remote mail server 49. (See Brown, 6: 25-32). Further, Brown discloses the local version of the folder configuration is created in "Microsoft Outlook," which provides a system of organizing messages. (See Brown, 5:1-9).

In contrast, amended independent claims 1, 7, and 8 recite creating *the same folder configuration* in a file system that reads documents by use of a scanner and files the documents on the basis of the obtained information. Thus, the present invention, as recited in independent claims 1, 7 and 8, analyzes a folder configuration created on mail software, and creates the same folder configuration in a file system.

Accordingly, an advantage of the embodiments of the present invention is to enable automatic creation of *filing folders*, without requiring a user to create filing folders, before an operation of reading paper information (documents) by use of a scanner and filing them. (As support, see for example paragraph [0005] of the present application).

To further clarify the distinguishing features of embodiments of the present invention, independent claims 1, 7 and 8 are amended herein to recite that the analysis of the folder configuration is performed at the time of startup of the file management software, regularly, or upon user's requests, and when the folder configuration of the mail software differs from that of the file system, the folder configuration of the file system is updated to match that of the mail software, as previously recited in dependent claim 2.

In contrast, the method disclosed by Brown is capable of merely updating and displaying, which is carried out by two different types of email software, and does not teach or even suggest creating a folder configuration in a file system that reads documents by use of a scanner and files the documents on the basis of obtained information.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 7 and 8 patentably distinguish over Brown. Further, Yeung fails to cure the deficiencies of Brown and, thus, it is further submitted that independent claims 1, 7 and 8 patentably distinguish over the prior art. Consequently, it is further submitted that dependent claim 3 also patentably distinguish over the prior art, for at least the reasons provided above for the independent claims.

In the Office Action, at item 3, claims 1 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Hendricks (U.S. 2003/0033271) in view of Yeung. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Similar to Brown, Hendricks discloses a transfer of folders from user A mail file 22 to user B mail file 24, and merely provides a method that is carried out between two different types of mail software. (See Hendricks, Fig. 5 and Fig. 6). The Examiner states that Hendricks discloses creating the same folder configuration in a file system, citing paragraph [0028] – [0029] of Hendricks. However the cited portions of Hendricks, as the Examiner suggests, merely discuss

recreating mail messages (which the Examiner interprets as "files"), but make no mention of creating a folder configuration that is the same as the analyzed configuration.

In contrast, independent claim 1, recites creating *the same folder configuration* in a file system that reads documents by use of a scanner and files the documents on the basis of the obtained information. As stated above, an advantage of the embodiments of the present invention is to enable automatic creation of filing folders, without requiring a user to create filing folders, before an operation of reading paper information (documents) by use of a scanner and filing them.

Hendricks does not teach or suggest creating a folder configuration in a file system. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the amended independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art. Consequently, it is further submitted that dependent claims 5 and 6 also patentably distinguish over the prior art, for at least the reasons provided above for independent claim 1.

In the Office Action, at item 4, claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hendricks in view of Yeung and further in view of Sykes (US Pre-Grant Publication 2002/0129108). The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1, which as stated above patentably distinguishes over the prior art. Further, it is submitted that Sykes fails to cure the deficiencies of Hendricks and Yeung set forth above. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claim 4 patentably distinguishes over the prior art for the reasons provided herein.

NEW INDEPENDENT CLAIM 9

New independent claim 9 recites creating the same folder configuration in a file system that reads documents by use of a scanner and files the documents on the basis of the obtained information, wherein when the folder configuration of the mail software differs from that of the file system, the folder configuration of the file system is updated to match that of the mail software.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that new independent claim 9 patentably distinguishes over the prior art for at least the reasons provided above for the other pending independent claims.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending

claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: November 7, 2006

By: Michael P. Stanley
Michael P. Stanley
Registration No. 58,523

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501